DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 297 UD 016 009

AUTHOR Blacklock, Thomas; Lusthaus, Charles
TITLE Report of the Early Stages of an OD Project in Two Inner City Secondary Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 76
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Biculturalism; Change Agents; Change Strategies; Educational Change; Educational Planning; Educational Problems; Feedback; *Inner City; Intervention; *Organizational Development; *Program Development; School Organization; School Surveys; *Secondary Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Quebec (Montreal)

ABSTRACT

This report presents the first stage results of an internal school board intervention in two inner city secondary schools in Montreal, Quebec. The Organizational Development (OD) technology of survey feedback was applied as an intervention technique to these schools. A response mode of planned change and development was attempted. The project goals were: (1) to develop a planned change response mode that would lead educators, parents, and students to articulate their needs and goals; (2) to use or develop organizational technologies in schools that could be helpful in moving schools toward a planned change response mode; and (3) to use or develop planned change responses in inner city high schools that had previously resisted major change efforts through using defensive or buffering responses. To implement the intervention within the existing school system, i.e., not using paid outside consultants, several unusual steps were taken and unique roles were established. First the school board used its only researcher to head up the present project. Second, the project director decided to introduce two full-time internal change agent positions. Finally, an advisory board was established whose purpose was to help the project staff work through the various stages of the intervention. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123297

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report of the Early Stages of an OD Project in Two Inner City Secondary Schools

for presentation at
American Education Research Association
April 1976
San Francisco, California.

UD 016 009

By: Thomas Blacklock and
Dr. Charles Lausthaus ← Should read Lusthaus

Assisted by: Dr. Fred Genesee
Joan Fitzpatrick
Jacqueline Freedman
Frances Weiser

Abstract

Report of the Early Stages of an OD Project in Two Inner City Secondary Schools.

The OD technology of survey feedback was applied as an intervention technique to two multi-cultural inner secondary schools. Although the schools differed considerably both were performing in an unsatisfactory manner. This study when completed will, hopefully, shed some light on the use of survey feedback as a method of improving the organizational characteristics of problem schools.

Student output performance data and data relating to the organizational characteristics of each school are being collected. Teachers, in-school administrators, students and parents are involved in the change process. The project was designed and is being directed by School Board resource personnel as opposed to external change agents.

This paper describes the first stages of the ongoing project and suggests some of the problems encountered in the use of the OD technology. Hopefully the next stage will help to answer the two basic questions:

(1) Is it possible to develop a state of readiness for change in malfunctioning secondary schools?

(2) Is survey feedback a useful technology for bringing about organizational change in secondary schools?

Paper presented at Session 6.16

Organizational Development: Empirical Studies in Diverse School Organizational Setting

1976 Annual Meeting - American Educational Research Association.

San Francisco, California.

REPORT OF THE EARLY STAGES OF AN OD PROJECT IN TWO INNER CITY SECONDARY SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the first stage results of an internal school board intervention in two inner city secondary schools in Montreal, Quebec. Both schools were built around 1920 and each serves about 650 students from a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds. Like many inner city schools across North America the two schools in the study have been subjected to a barrage of criticism. The criticisms range in degree and intensity, but generally focus on ineffective teaching, inadequate facilities, irrelevant curriculum, excessive vandalism, high failure rates, and unsatisfactory student control.* These criticisms have come from the school community, the media, elected board members and the central office staff. Schools have responded to these criticisms with new innovations that have rarely seemed to be successful in overcoming the initial problems.

One plausible explanation for the frequent unsuccessful response to these criticisms is that schools do not know how to respond to their complex environment. Jury, Willower, and DeLacy (1955, P.299) characterized this complex environment by indicating that schools have "... vague and diverse goals, ambiguous criteria for success, lack of a widely accepted technology of teaching, a mandated relationship with clients who may or may not be willing participants, high population density, stimulus overload for teachers, a host of logistical problems and political vulnerability." All of these characteristics seem to apply to the inner city secondary experience of the two schools in the study.

In looking at the complex environment of the Montreal, Quebec schools, the aspect of political vulnerability must be emphasized. During the last 15 years the Quebec educational system has experienced what some have called "The Quiet Revolution" in that the system has undergone major financial, structural and social changes. In the past decade the system has changed from

* Data on these issues has been collected in these cases and will be used to monitor the efficacy of this project. However, due to the possible sensitive nature of the data, it will not be reported in this phase of the project.

a locally funded system to a provincially funded system. During these years legislation has changed decentralized local structures into a centralized bureaucracy. Furthermore, during the same time the system has changed from classical elite schools to one in which every child has the right to post secondary education. The complexity of the system is compounded by the fact that schools are legally classified as Roman Catholic or Protestant, either of which may operate in the French language or the English language, or both. Finally, in recent attempts to make schools more sensitive to their communities, the government has established regulations which require each school to establish an Advisory Parent Committee.

Deal (1975) argues that when schools are faced with environmental complexity they tend to respond in one of three ways. First, the schools may attempt to separate or isolate themselves from the complexities of the environment. This is done by invoking bureaucratic rules, arguing relentlessly, using committee structures or using grievance procedures in order to avoid an issue. For example, in one of the high schools in this study, the teachers were concerned about the lack of communication. This problem was discussed at a staff meeting. Data was obtained about the problem but school members dismissed the data because it had to do with people's feelings. This lack of commitment is called a <u>defensive response</u> to environmental complexity.

The second response is manifested by schools when they seemingly agree to respond to environmental pressures for change, but do so in a passive way. This is seen when schools agree to receive new programs, research reports, or specialists, but do not set up the structural mechanisms to integrate the change so that it can respond to the environmental pressure. For example, one of the schools in the study developed a cooperative tutoring system with a nearby university in response to poor achievement by many grade 8 and grade 9 students in the core program. Senior university students provided individual tutoring to students. The teachers identified the students and released them during regular class time for tutoring. The university students became unhappy with the program and questioned its usefulness because the teachers did not provide them with any formal feedback. The university students felt that this indicated a lack of teacher support for the program. The program is in danger of collapsing because the teachers did not coordinate the new program with the existing program. This type of response is called a

buffering response.

The third response is manifested by schools when they set up mechanism to internally deal with, or externally influence the environment. This is seen in decentralized school models, ad hoc project groups, new school roles, matrix and project structures. These are viewed as organizational responses which can actively adapt to changes in the environment. This response mode is called planned change and development. The difference between this response mode and the other two lies in the extent to which the organization integrates the change into its role relationships and normative structure. Such integration needs careful planning, development, and commitment.

In the present intervention, the response mode of planned change and development was attempted. The project goals were: first, to develop a planned change response mode that would lead educators, parents and students to articulate their needs and goals; second, to use or develop organizational technologies in schools that could be helpful in moving schools toward a planned change response mode; and finally, to use or develop planned change responses in inner city high schools that had previously resisted major change efforts through using defensive or buffering responses.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS THE PLANNED CHANGE RESPONSE

To fulfill the above goals, the theory and technology of organizational development was chosen by the school system in developing this intervention. Organizational development is one type of a planned change response mode. It is an applied field which uses the theories developed in the behavioural sciences. Its goal is to provide capabilities to organizations so that they are able to develop planned responses to environmental complexity (Deal, 1975).

Theoretical Assumptions of OD Applied to the Intervention

Since organizational development is an applied field of study, its underlying values and assumptions are critical in analyzing its applicability to a school intervention. A number of authors (e.g., French and Bell, 1973; Schmuck, 1974) have articulated assumptions lying behind OD interventions. These assumptions, as adapted to this particular intervention, are as follows:

1. Assumptions about educators, parents and children:
   (a) Educators, parents, and children seek rewards and satisfaction from school organizations.
   The rewards and satisfaction of these groups can be compatible with the school goals.

   (b) Educators, parents and children can make a larger contribution to the organizational goals but are inhibited from doing so.

   (c) The motives most important to educators, parents and children are achievement, power and affiliation.
   Each work at different times and in different ways but one is usually favoured over the other two.

2. Assumptions about work groups in schools - (e.g. parent councils, teacher councils, student councils, departments):
   (a) School groups seek a favourable climate in which to work.

   (b) School groups seek to be an integrated part of the organization.

   (c) School groups seek to fulfill members' achievement, power, and affiliation needs.

   (d) School groups seek to be important parts of the school problem-solving capabilities.

3. Assumptions about schools:
   (a) Schools adopt buffering or defensive modes of behaviour to environmental complexities because they have not learned skills involved with planned change and development.

   (b) Schools are made up in part of school groups each responding to the demands placed upon them by other groups. The way to change existing response modes is for the groups to learn and experience alternative patterns of behaviour.

   (c) Schools have developed a network of roles and role relationships which have not facilitated planned change efforts.

3. (d) Schools lack information systems which would facilitate their planned response to complex environments.

(e) Schools' goals are not stable. They shift in relation to individual and group needs for achievement, power, and affilitation. The society at large also adds to the goal complexity of schools.

OD Procedures
Applied to the Intervention

The technology of OD has been well documented in the planned change literature in schools e.g., (Schmuck and Miles, 1972; Schmuck, 1974). Generally the procedure includes the following stages: 1) an entry and contracting phase whereby the goals, objectives, and expectations for the intervention are clarified between the intervenor and the relevant school personnel; 2) an information-gathering phase which usually includes data about the organizational structure and interpersonal climate; 3) a feedback phase which focuses on problems uncovered in the data-gathering; it includes a skill development component that develops problem-solving capabilities of the school; 4) a monitoring stage which helps develop organizational learning experiences so that members can develop productive ways of identifying and working on problems. Throughout the OD procedures there is heavy emphasis on collaboration between the intervenor and the staff.

In the pesent intervention, these general OD procedures were planned. In order to implement these processes within the existing school system, i.e., not using paid outside consultants, several unusual steps were taken and unique roles were established. First, the school board used its only researcher to head up the present project. His usual job was to develop a research information system in the area of second language instruction. He acted as the project director but on the basis that he must find the time outside of his first research commitment. Second, the project director decided to introduce two full-time animator positions. The animators acted as the internal change agents. They were expected to work with the principals, school councils, student councils, etc., to carry out the intervention. Finally, an advisory board was established whose purpose was to help the project director and the animators work through the various stages of the intervention. Its members were the two animators, the school board's inner

city school consultant, the school board's planning coordinator, a faculty member from McGill University, and the project director.

THE CASES

Background Information

The school board in which this project is being conducted is one of eight school boards serving the metropolitan area of Montreal. There are 96 elementary and secondary schools under the school board's jurisdiction. Approximately 20% of the schools serve inner city communities.

The Montreal Island School Council is a coordinating body for the eight school boards. Surveys and studies conducted by the Council documented the need for major upgrading of the educational services in Montreal's inner city. The Council initiated a number of programs aimed at improving some of the most pressing problems. In December, 1974 the Island Council encouraged the school boards to develop research projects which would help to define the needs of their inner city schools.

The research proposal for the present intervention was developed after opinions and ideas were solicited through a series of meetings among people associated with inner city education: namely, school principals, teachers, social workers, board officers, university professors, and psychometricians. Also, an exmination of literature relating to inner city school problems and educational change was completed before developing the proposal.

The proposal was submitted to and approved by the school council of the two schools participating in the study. The school council is a committee of teachers elected by the teachers in each school and with whom the principal must consult regarding every policy change in the school. Following the school councils' approval, the proposal was accepted by the school board. The Island Council accepted the proposal without hesitation and by June, 1975 provided funding.

School 1.

Entry Stage

The project's entry stage into the school was officially begun in March of 1975. The project director attended a meeting of the school council, described the project, answered questions, and requested the council to pass

a resolution accepting the project in their school. This request was complied with by the council.

The next phase of the entry process occurred during the last week of June. The final examinations were completed and the teachers and administrators were preoccupied with the process of closing the school. It was in this atmosphere that the newly appointed animator was introduced to the school. She visited the school along with the project director and one other member of the advisory board. The purpose of this meeting was threefold: first, to introduce the animators to the principal and vice-principal; secondly, to provide the animator with the opportunity to describe in some detail her proposed operational methods and goals; third, to organize with the principal the introduction of the animator to the staff during one of the year end staff meetings. It was agreed that the animator would describe her perceptions of the project to the staff and solicit their reaction. Following the meeting with the principal, and later the meeting with the staff, the animator indicated to the advisory board a concern that neither the principal nor the staff understood the project. For example, the principal claimed that "we had gone through this exercise six months ago and written a report." This left the animator with feelings of stress and insecurity.

There was very little project development during the summer vacation period as the animator had made prior commitments. Thus the animator was to enter the school in September along with the teachers. No action was taken to strengthen the seemingly unclear position that characterized her formal introduction to the school. Upon reflecting on the situation during the months of July and August, the animator resigned. Another animator was engaged by the project director and therefore upon opening date the school was presented with a new animator. The project director introduced the new animator to the staff during the first staff meeting in September.

Information Gathering Stage

During the first six weeks of the project's operation, that is, from school opening until mid October, the animator proceeded to obtain information about the school and clarify her role in the school. The role during this period was described by the animator as follows: "I presented myself at staff meetings and at meetings of various groups within the school, e.g. school

council, department heads, and student council, to increase my personal understanding of the organization of the school. As well, I spent a great deal of time in the staff room watching the types of interactions among the teaching staff; the level of communication; the patterns of communication, and so on. My role at these functions was that of observer. There was no active participation on my part in these meetings." Many informal interviews were also conducted with teachers and students during this period. The student interviews involved class visits as well as individual interviews. A careful diary was kept recording all observations. At the end of this period the animator indicated to the advisory board that she had obtained information but still had not clarified her position in the school.

After several weeks of informal data collection, the animator decided to make the first attempt at getting direct staff participation in the project by the establishment of a staff committee to assist in more formalized data-gathering procedures. The request for the formation of such a committee was made by the animator at the school council meeting in early October. The council complied by establishing a committee and naming five staff members, along with the project animator. The principal was one of the five staff members who volunteered to serve on the committee.

The staff, particularly the principal of the school, was sensitive to public criticism. This situation was aggravated by an event which occurred two years ago. The community was unhappy with the school and in the process of venting their feelings a newspaper reporter was contacted and requested to write a story on the school. The story focused on the physical condition of the building which was displayed in a very unfavourable manner. As a form of remedial action a staff committee was established to evaluate the school's real problems. The committee recommendations focused nearly entirely on physical improvements, such as new water fountains and lavatories, a new auditorium and several cosmetic physical improvements. The school's recommendations were presented to the school board and capital improvements totaling approximately $150,000 were made.

Typical of defensive and buffering responses, each time the staff examined the needs of the school, the only needs that emerged were related to physical facilities; this was the only area with which they wanted to deal. The project director was confronted with this problem several times when he

approached the school: first, when he secured an agreement to go ahead with the project; second, at the meetings in which the animators were introduced to the school staff; and finally, when the recently established sub-committee began to formulate plans for collecting and sharing data about the school. When the animator attempted to widen the data base to include such things as students' performance, behaviour, absenteeism, perceptions of the school, and data from the parents and teachers, she was accused of being manipulative, and of avoiding the issue of physical facilities. The animator requested that the project director clarify her position at a meeting of the school council. The director and the inner city consultant reiterated the purposes of the project and the role of the animator. The clarification presented by them was consistent with their two previous justifications of the project to the staff. It was stated that: 1) there is compelling research which indicates that expenditures on equipment and facilities will not necessarily improve educational output in inner city schools, and 2) that the Island Council will not provide any more special funds for inner city schools until the schools identify and justify their needs. The school council, once again, agreed to permit the project to continue.

The project sub-committee in the next few days developed a plan for data collection. (see Appendix). The animator was given time during a staff meeting in which to present the plan, to discuss the process of data collection, and to discuss the process of using the data. The staff meeting passed a resolution which agreed: (a) to continue the project as outlined in the guidelines; (b) to an opinion survey that would be undertaken in the form of a questionnaire, approved by a committee; (c) to an agreement that surveys would be universally administered.

During both the entry and data-gathering stages of the project, the teachers in the Montreal school system were involved with contract negotiations. Toward the end of October the teachers decided to withdraw from all but legally mandated duties as one of their pressure tactics. This included work on this project. Thus the school project committee ceased meeting. However, the animator carried on with the data collecting process and the development of the opinion survey questionnaire. In late December the school council met to deal with some pressing concerns. This meeting presented the animator with the opportunity to report to the council that the questionnaire was ready to

administer. The animator requested the council's cooperation in administering the questionnaire in mid January, and their agreement to set aside a full professional day in February to: (a) share the data, and (b) begin a discussion of goals and priorities that might arise from a study of the data. The council agreed to both requests.

In January, as planned, the animator handed out a questionnaire to all professional employees of the school. Its purpose was to gather information on teachers' perceptions of the existing goals of the school, structure of decision-making and communication, problems of the school, and issues of curriculum. Since it was approved by the council, it was anticipated by the animator that all of the staff would cooperate. However, the staff response to the questionnaire was only 53%. Several teachers indicated that they considered it to be contrary to union policy to participate in the questionnaire.

In general, the data indicated a real concern over unclear goals and direction, inappropriate curriculum and methods, behaviour problems, lack of communication with the parents. The data revealed a clear call for "more humanistic" ways of dealing with the students and new "school structure".

Feedback Stage

Shortly after the school council had made the decision to grant the professional day in February, it referred the decision to a staff meeting. The staff meeting approved the original decision but requested more details about the actual plan for the professional day. In a series of four meetings, between February 10 and February 17, the staff modified the original decision to only a half day workshop with the following conditions: (1) that there could be no "outsiders" and, (2) that there could be no small groups. The latter two conditions were made after the detailed workshop plan was presented to the staff, and it included both an "outside expert" and a "small group" format. Still at this stage there was little evidence that the school wanted to adopt a planned change response. Buffering and defensive responses was still their modus operandi.

The half day workshop was held at the end of February. Some differences were noted at this workshop.

At the beginning of the project difficult and stressful issues were frequently not confronted. The strict adherence to formal and procedural behaviour at meetings was the frequently used 'defensive response'. In contrast, the workshop developed into a very confrontive and emotional meeting. The animator permitted her agenda to be displaced and relinquished the leadership of the workshop. A small group of teachers who were leaders in the school council and the union had planned confrontation with the purpose of aborting the project, and they brought to the workshop a prearranged motion to this effect. They charged the animator with dishonesty and manipulation. Many concerns about the school, the students, and the programs were expressed. The questionnaire data had indicated that many of the staff felt the need to improve their school. Also at this meeting several staff members spoke in favour of the project as a useful method of doing so. However, the opposition group threatened to resign from their leadership roles if support for their motion was not given. Although many of the staff voiced support for the project they decided to abstain from voting on the motion to stop the project because they did not want to lose the leadership in the school. The vote on the motion indicated that the project would not go on. However, close to half of the staff abstained from the voting. The project was discontinued.

The school council chairman led the protest against the project. He signed the letter which officially provided notification of the project's termination. His letter reverted back to earlier organizational 'defensive response' behaviour. It was written in a very formalized method and re-stated an earlier school council resolution:

> " That this High School lacks certain facilities common to non "inner city" high schools within the School Board, which lack of facilities denies our students opportunities for educational, social, and personal growth normally offered to other high school students. "

Some staff members unofficially stated they would like to see the project reinstated. The principal and vice-principal made a similar statement to the project director. They indicated that a re-negotiation process could take place if appropriate contract and expectations occur. Clearly the issue of physical facilities would have to be faced once again.

School 2.

Entry and Information-Gathering Stages

Similar to entry in School 1, the animator was introduced to the principal and staff in June and re-introduced to the principal and staff in September. From September to early October, the animator held informal meetings with staff and students trying to understand the major issues of the school.

By the end of September the animator felt that she had gained the confidence of the principal and most of the staff. She decided to complete the information gathering phase through the use of a questionnaire. The questionnaire would also serve as an indicator to check on the number of staff members willing to make at least minimal commitment to the intervention. The questionnaire checked for perceptions of formal and actual goals, teacher cooperation, commitment, changes and communications. The questionnaire was handed out to all staff members who were asked to respond within four days. After this time approximately half the questionnaires were returned. This discouraged the animator. When she asked the teachers the reasons for their lack of response, they indicated they were busy and overworked or that they had forgotten. Within a few days the response rate rose to approximately 66%. The animator indicated that this response, though discouraging, would be large enough to furnish feedback data and to begin some limited organizational training.

Feedback and Training Stage

The animator indicated from results of her entry and data gathering that the school operated more frequently through the use of small committees than through general staff meetings. She seemed sensitive to the fact that her own legitimacy to work in the school required entry into existing structures rather than through new structures that would be developed by the project. One committee that seemed to be an avenue for her entry into the sub-systems of the school was the Professional Day Planning Committee.

The Professional Day Planning Committee had been established early in the school year. There are several professional days scheduled throughout the year. They are days in which students do not attend school and teachers are expected to carry out a range of professional activities, includ-

ing workshops and school planning sessions. In the past this committee attempted to design yearly plans for the school. However, these plans were often resisted by the staff and were not received positively. Generally their way of operating was to have all staff members do the same thing on each professional day. Having data concerning individual interests and needs of varying staff members, the animator was able to suggest to the group that they solicit interest areas that faculty members could participate in through small groups. Ideas which were generated by the faculty in a survey by the Professional Day Committee included:

1) visiting parents in their homes
2) improving the image of the school
3) visiting other schools to exchange ideas and to examine curriculum
4) building up community resources
5) developing departmentalized projects

Various faculty members joined each group as part of their own professional growth plan for the year. The groups provided an avenue through which the animator could do some group training, as well as feedback data about her findings in the school. Also, the animator found herself prodding and assisting the groups when appropriate, e.g., teaching the committees to do brainstorming and problem-solving.

This mode of operation was instrumental in leading the school council to authorize two professional days to be set aside for problem-solving workshops in late October. The condition was imposed by the school council that they did not want to have outside "experts"
Both the administration and the teachers expressed the wish to work on the problems and priorities of the school. The original questionnaire which was given to the staff provided data that influenced the workshop design. Before starting the workshop the animator requested that the school council reconsider the use of outside personnel and indicated that the university professor with whom she had worked would be a help to her. Her rationale was accepted.

The first day of the workshop focused on the development of skill areas necessary for problem-solving, e.g., forced-field analysis training. The second day was chiefly devoted to developing consensus and priorities on important staff concerns. Many of the priorities upon which consensus was

reached fell into two broad categories: 1) alteration of working climate, and 2) reformulation of goals and redesigning existing structures. The last part of the workshop was spent in a 'brainstorming' session in which each group attempted to think of follow-up techniques relating to the concerns identified. An interview survey of teachers and administration indicated that the workshop was viewed by some as being helpful. The animator reported a steady improvement in organizational climate following the workshop in terms of informal communications and openness. There was evidence of staff willingness to participate in a cooperative manner and more attempt at problem-solving, rather than assigning blame.

Throughout the committee meetings and continuing through the workshop days, the animator reported general willingness on the part of the staff to talk to each other about their concerns. This, the animator indicated, was a different meeting pattern.

Approximately two weeks after the workshop the teachers decided to withdraw all but legally mandated services. This action was taken in response to unsuccessful collective agreement negotiations as was referred to in School 1. The teachers tactics began to take on coercive measures. It became apparent that the project work under these conditions would be difficult. The negotiations continued to deteriorate, and by late November the organizational climate within the schools was very tense. Teachers had ceased to participate in all extra-curricular activities, all school and central school board committees, and all meetings except those relating directly to the teachers' welfare. Dysfunctional and coercive behaviour continued to grow. The teachers refused to report student attendance and would not make any written reports concerning students' achievement. Sporadic work stoppages began, and the school board began the process of salary deductions for the time which was lost from work.

During this time the animator continued to work in committees that the teachers viewed to be related to their own welfare. The animator reported that even within these committees, the climate for planned change dissipated. The optimistic view that was presented by the animator at the beginning of November was changed to a pessimistic description of organizational behaviour by late February. The staff behaviour was described by the animator this time in terms of "perceived feelings of powerlessness,

negative feelings, negative posture about the possibilities of working out the solutions to their own problems, and general lack of interest."

In February a professional day was proposed that resulted in a speck of renewed interest. The principal proposed that the professional day be used to study an inner city policy paper that had been developed for presentation to the school board. The school principal, through the Professional Association of Principals, had access to it because it had been presented to the principals as part of a consultative process. After examining the document the council agreed to make it the subject of the professional day. The council plannned the workshop. A folder was presented to each staff member prior to the workshop which included the policy paper and the workshop plan. The staff, including the administration and the animator, were assigned to workshop groups. Each group of five or six members was chaired by a member of the school council.

The workshop was followed up by the school council which drafted a position paper that represented a consensus of opinion from the various workshop groups about the inner city paper. The council agreed to report back to the staff with the draft paper and to modify it if necessary. Following this, a final position paper would be prepared as representing the official view of the school on this policy.

The first draft of the position paper indicated among other things that there was some concern among the staff over the role and function of the guidance department. This department took exception to the insinuations in the draft and began to develop a defensive posture towards the council's paper by developing a paper which attacked the council. Through negotiations with the department the animator indicated that this situation could be used to inform the school about the role that the guidance department sees itself playing. They have accepted the suggestion and have produced a first draft of a paper which explains their role. Interviews by the animator with personnel in the guidance department indicate that they are extremely pleased with the paper and have suggested that other departments might find it worthwhile to do the same thing.

Parents and Students

In the two schools the animators have made only entry contacts with parents and students. Working with the parents proved to be more difficult

than anticipated. In the first school the parents' council did not get properly organized. The first chairman resigned over a personal problem that his son had in the school. The leadership was not effective so the parents formed an ad hoc committee. However, it was not able to integrate into the school structure and did not represent either the parents or the school in any official manner. The teachers and administration in the school did not appear to be supportive of the parent council. In the second school, attempts to work with the parents were also non-productive. Problems arose from several sources: many parents are employed in 'shift work' jobs or they work long hours, so it is not easy for them to attend meetings. Furthermore, parents have norms that are different from North American norms. The women stay at home, only the men attend meetings. The school represents authority and it confuses the parents to be consulted about school matters.

Only superficial contacts have been made with the students because the decision was made by the advisory board to work first with teachers, then parents, and finally, the students.

DISCUSSION

The project in the two inner city high schools is now seven months old. It is too early to talk about its long range impact on these schools. We have described the events to date and will continue monitoring the logs of the animators, the notes of our advisory committee, the questionnaire data, and the school board data concerning student performance. As we take time to reflect on the events of the past seven months, a number of issues arise.

The first issue is one which has been raised by Runkel (1974). He indicated that certain schools exhibit readiness characteristics for planned change OD efforts while other schools do not, and said that the probability of success in those that are not ready is considerably lower than in those which are ready. The schools in the study did not show the readiness characteristics described by Runkel, such as willingness to entertain unusual and even anxiety-producing ideas, a desire for collaborative work, a commitment of support from the central office, and an expectation that key leaders would remain in the school for at least two years after the project starts. However, the school board indicated that their responsibility was to put a priority on improving schools such as those in the study. How does the school

board, using internal planned change interventions, develop a strategy that has a higher probability of success than Runkel indicates? Does organizational development only work in schools that are already change oriented?

The second issue concerns the use of buffering postures by the schools during the contracting procedures. The project was explained in detail several times, yet the school personnel seldom raised questions concerning how the project would work. They responded positively to the plans but did not commit themselves to carry out the committee work involved in the project. The efforts to make it work were left to the animators and the advisory committee. Thus the entry process never involved a clear commitment of involvement by the school parties. In retrospect this is seen as a buffering response.

The third issue raised involves the value conflict which may exist between the humanistic change-oriented perspective of organizational development and the more traditional values that may be held in inner city communities and schools. This issue was raised by McMillan (1975) when he attributed part of the failure of an inner city intervention to a contradiction between change agent leadership style and the situational values of the community. He indicated that the change agent displayed democratic and humanitarian values in a system that rejected these values. He hypothesized that the change agent leadership style most appropriate in organizations which display a low value for democratic and humanitarian values would tend toward high task - low relationship. The high relationship - low task leadership would be misconstrued as "weak" leadership. In the present project the animators selected, tended to have a high relationship - low task orientation which was reinforced by the project's advisory committee. An interesting question is raised by these considerations. In choosing change agent personnel in schools, should we be matching school and community values to change agent leadership styles, or is the resolution of the conflicts that exist part of the intervention itself?

The fourth issue involves the lack of free time available to teachers which is necessary in order for them to be involved in planned change efforts. The teachers in schools of this project are engaged with classes 27 or 35 periods per week. They do not have much day-to-day time to engage in activities that do not relate directly to their teaching situation. If we are

to develop planned change in our schools it appears that some free or slack time must be structured into the school year, specifically for this change. Is it realistic to expect teachers to be involved in long term planned change efforts if these efforts are "add on responsibilities" to a seemingly already full work load?

A fifth issue involves the lack of the project's relevance to the teachers. The purpose of the school board's project was to define needs, goals, and action for schools in the inner city, but the teachers' needs seemed to be focused on contract negotiations, job security, declining enrollments - things which can be conceptualized as survival concerns. These concerns were not within the control of the schools. It became apparent that the teachers' concerns were not compatible with the larger system concerns. The project's first assumption indicates that there should be a unity between individual and organizational goals. In this case the unity may exist at the school level but at the larger organizational level the unity breaks down. Is OD an appropriate planned change response in schools whose survival concerns are contrary to the larger organizational system goals thus violating the assumptions of goal congruity?

These are some of the questions that have been generated in working on this project: the questions come a lot faster than the answers. Perhaps at this time next year we can generate some hypotheses to test so that the theory of OD can be advanced.

REFERENCES

Deal, T.E., Survey Feedback: A Tool for Developing New Organizational Responses to Complex Educational Environments: Research and Development Memorandum #135, Stanford University, 1975.

French, W.E., Bell, C.H., Organization Development, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973.

Jury, L.E., Willower, D.J., DeLacy, W.J., Teacher Self-Actualization and Pupil Control Ideology. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. Edmonton, Vol. XXI, No. 4, 1975. pp. 295-301.

McMillan, Charles B., Organizational Development in Schools: Bedford-Stuyvesant, The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, December, 1975. pp. 437-456.

Runkel, Philip J., Conditions for Success and Failure of Organizational Development in Schools, Center for Education Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1974.

Schmuck, Richard A., Bringing Parents and Students into School Management: A New Program of Research and Development on Organization Development. Education and Urban Society, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, VI (2), February, 1974.

Schmuck, R.A., Miles, M.B., eds., Organizational Development in Schools. National Press Books, Palo Alto, 1971.

A P P E N D I X

INFORMATION TO BE GATHERED

THE POPULATION

- Census data on home environment
- income
- language
- ethnic origin
- length of residence

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

- Drop-out statistics in past years
- % successful matriculation
- % entering post secondary education
- % working
- Reading and math. levels (Standard test)

SOCIO-SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

- rate of vandalism
- rate of absenteeism
- rate of skipping
- degree of parental involvement
- degree of student government participation

COMPARISONS OF GOALS OF STAFF--STUDENTS--PARENTS

NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHO WORK--HOW--WHY

SCHOOL PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- way in which physical environment affects program and student way of life

THE FACULTY

- Degree of training
- Rate of turnover
- Rate of absenteeism
- Workload
- Student-teacher ratio
- Ethnic background

END

DEPT. OF HEW

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

SEPT 10 76